

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-30, 32, 33, 38-46 and 48 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 34 and 37 are allowed. Claims 1-18, 20-30, 32, 33, 38-42, 44 and 48 are rejected. Claims 45 and 46 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 44, and 48 have been amended. Claim 34 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 2, 6, 12-18, 20-30, 32, 33, 38-43, 45, and 46 have been cancelled. New claims 49-64 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,184,490 B1 to Rybicki, et al. ("Rybicki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,316 B1 to Tomich, et al. ("Tomich"). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2 and 6. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 2 and 4-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2 and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Tomich as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,515 to Toivola ("Toivola"). Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of claims 2 and 6, and the patentability of amended claim 1 over Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola will be discussed herein. Claims 2 and 6 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a signal distributor that deserializes the analog multi-carrier signal into a plurality of analog carrier signals, where the signal distributor comprises at least one stopband filter having at least one stopband with an associated center frequency that can be adjusted by an associated exciter. The Office Action attributes this teaching to Toivola, but the

cited section of Toivola appears to describe a bandpass filter, all frequencies but the preferred frequency are filtered away in the Toivola system. In a bandstop filter, all frequencies but the targeted frequencies are passed. It is submitted that the use of a bandstop filter for this purpose is somewhat counterintuitive, especially in combination with the deserializer used to separate the signals, but provides an advantage in that frequency bands associated with one of a plurality of analog signals can be selectively attenuated, allowing for removal of in band noise produced during the serializing and deserializing process. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is novel and nonobvious over the cited art.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 each depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus submitted that claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Tomich as applied to claim 2, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,291,924 to Lau, et al. ("Lau"). Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and Lau does not appear to remedy the deficiencies of Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola as described above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Tomich in view of Toivola as applied to claim 2, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0171674 A1 to Jago, et al. ("Jago"). Claim 8 depends from claim 1, and Jago does not appear to remedy the deficiencies of Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola as described above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Tomich as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,664,921 B2 to Pratt ("Pratt"). Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and Pratt does not appear to remedy the deficiencies of Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola as described above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Tomich as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,983 to Naidu, et al. ("Naidu"). Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, and Naidu does not appear to remedy the deficiencies of Rybicki, Tomich, and Toivola as described above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 12-18, 20-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12-18 and 20-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various references. All of these claims have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 28-30, 32, and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 28-30, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various references. Claims 28-30, 32, and 33 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

IX. Rejection of Claims 38-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 38-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various references. Claims 38-43 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

X. Rejection of Claims 44 and 48 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0051433 A1 to Affes, et al. ("Affes") in view of Pratt. Claim 44 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 45, which has been indicated as containing allowable matter. Claim 48 depends from claim 44 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

XI. New Claims 49-55

Claims 49-55 have been added. Each of claims 49-55 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 44. Since claim 44 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 45, which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least for their dependence on claim 44.

XII. New Claims 56-64

Claims 56-64 have been added. Claim 56 has been drafted to incorporate the combined subject matter of claim 46, which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, and claim 44, its base claim. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 56 should be allowable. Each of claims 57-64 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 56. It is respectfully submitted that claims are allowable for at least for their dependence on claim 56.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 21, 2007

/Christopher P. Harris/

Christopher P. Harris

Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.

1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114

Phone: (216) 621-2234

Fax: (216) 621-4072